

the war debts. Again private loans and advances made by the Government for domestic reconstruction seem to stand upon the same basis.

We are warned that we must accept an unfavorable trade balance if the debts are to be repaid.

It is by no means clear that the debts can be paid only in gold or by the creation of an unfavorable trade balance against the United States.

Our European debtors will in the future apply the ordinary practices of merchandising in their trade and commerce with the United States, as they have in the past. It is impossible to accept estimates of increases. Enduring trade advantages can not be purchased by the cancellation of the debts.

Military disarmament is desirable; its obvious benefits are appreciated. But permanent disarmament must proceed upon more substantial bases than those advanced in the arguments thus far submitted for the cancellation or further reduction of the debts.

Who can say that if the debtors are compelled to pass payments now due or hereafter maturing that the ill effect upon their credit standing so far as it relates to military expenditures may not in the long run become a greater factor for good than any temporary holiday in the construction of military armaments purchased with the cash of the American taxpayer through cancellation of the war debts?

#### COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. Mr. President, by direction of the steering committee, I ask that the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] be excused from further service upon the Committee on Interstate Commerce, and that he be assigned to service on the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I also ask that the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] be excused from further service upon the Committee on Military Affairs, and that he be assigned to duty upon the Committee on Interstate Commerce to fill the vacancy created a moment ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT Without objection, that order will be made.

Mr. ROBINSON of Arkansas. I ask that the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. REYNOLDS] be assigned to the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Military Affairs.

The VICE PRESIDENT Without objection, that order will be made.

#### THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed. The Calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I ask unanimous consent that the calling of the Calendar be suspended.

The VICE PRESIDENT Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 301) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER, a Representative from the State of Virginia.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. GLASS. Mr. President, I present resolutions which I send to the desk, and ask for their immediate consideration.

The resolutions (S. Res. 288) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. HENRY ST. GEORGE TUCKER, late a Representative from the State of Virginia.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

#### DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CHARLES A. KARCH

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 303) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. CHARLES A. KARCH, a Representative from the State of Illinois.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. GLENN. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The resolutions (S. Res. 289) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. CHARLES A. KARCH, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

#### DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE J. CHARLES LINTHICUM

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 300) was read as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. J. CHARLES LINTHICUM, a Representative from the State of Maryland.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I offer the resolutions which I send to the desk, and ask for their immediate consideration.

The resolutions (S. Res. 290) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. J. CHARLES LINTHICUM, late a Representative from the State of Maryland.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

#### DEATH OF THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE JAMES C. McLAUGHLIN

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a resolution from the House of Representative, which will be read.

The resolution (H. Res. 302) was read, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the House has heard with profound sorrow of the death of Hon. JAMES C. McLAUGHLIN, a Representative from the State of Michigan.

*Resolved*, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I send to the desk resolutions and ask unanimous consent for their immediate consideration.

The resolutions (S. Res. 291) were read, considered by unanimous consent, and unanimously agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. JAMES C. McLAUGHLIN, late a Representative from the State of Michigan.

*Resolved*, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased Representatives I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was unanimously agreed to; and (at 1 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 7, 1932, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1932

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We thank Thee, our Heavenly Father, that Thou art ever near the whisper-reach of the souls of men. Make us sensitive to Thy overtures, that we may keenly realize the greatness of Thy love, the pity of Thy heart, and the strength of Thy grace; may we hug these riches to our perishing bosoms. Our country, with its manifold needs, is calling us; great tasks are at our doors. Almighty God, be pleased to help

us crave the ambition to toil for our fellow citizens with free and earnest hearts. Be in all our councils, that we may labor, live, and love, so that the unborn to-morrows shall call us blessed. Preserve Thou the health of our bodies and the vigor of our minds, and ever whisper to us in that music that can not be misunderstood. Thou who art the Creator of the heavens and earth, make known Thy way among all peoples and Thy saving grace among all nations. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

#### REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed on the part of the House to join with a like committee upon the part of the Senate, to notify the President of the United States that the two Houses had assembled and that a quorum was present and that the Houses were ready for business, report that they have performed their duty, and beg leave to further report that the President advised them that he would communicate with both Houses to-day in writing, and that to-morrow he would send down his Budget message, and that later on in the session there would be further messages.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

#### ANNUAL MESSAGE OF THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 401)

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union and ordered printed.

[For message see Senate proceedings.]

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNS. Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen of the House, I have received so many inquiries as to the status of the appropriation bills that I feel it is proper to take a few minutes to tell the entire membership of the House just what the progress with reference to the preparation of those bills has been and is now. Prior to the election, following the usual custom, I requested the Director of the Budget to furnish to the Committee on Appropriations advance copies or proofs of the Budget estimates for the various departments, and particularly with reference to the Treasury and the Post Office appropriation bill, and the Interior, the Agricultural, and the State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor appropriation bills, as well as the bill for the War Department. I stated to him that it was my purpose to begin hearings as soon after election as possible, and that the date of November 14 had been fixed to begin hearings on those bills, provided he would be in a position to furnish us with those advance proofs. The Director of the Budget responded freely and promptly and stated that he would have those estimates before the committee at the earliest possible moment. There was some delay of two days, and as a result the subcommittee on the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill did not actually begin its hearings until November 16. The subcommittees on the other bills I mentioned began their hearings within a day or two thereafter. Since that time all of these subcommittees have been steadily at work, beginning early in the morning, sometimes before 10 o'clock, proceeding all day, and sometimes until late in the evening.

The hearings on the Post Office and Treasury appropriation bill were concluded last week. About that time there appeared a statement in the newspapers that the President was contemplating sending additional estimates reducing those estimates that had been submitted. The subcommittee felt, therefore, that under those circumstances, and

also because it was not considered a proper thing to do to present an appropriation bill in advance of the Budget message of the President, that the preparation of that bill should be delayed for a few days. We began to mark up that bill this morning, starting at 9.30 o'clock, and we are going to proceed with that all day up into the night if necessary, hoping to complete writing the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill by 12 o'clock to-morrow.

I am informed by the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], who is the chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the Interior appropriation bill, and by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], who is chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the agricultural bill, that their bills will follow along in quick succession.

After that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER], chairman of the subcommittee in charge of the State, Justice, Commerce, and Labor appropriation bill, and the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLLINS], chairman of the subcommittee having under consideration the War Department appropriation bill, will be ready to report, so that if the way is clear and the opportunity presented, there will be no delay on the part of the Committee on Appropriations in the consideration of these appropriation bills, because the other four regular bills and the deficiency bills will be prepared and be ready as soon as those other bills are out of the way.

It has been my hope, and it is still my hope, that this House can consider, with due deliberation, and pass three of those bills between now and the holiday recess, if one is taken, to wit, the Treasury and Post Office appropriation bill, the Interior Department appropriation bill, and the Agriculture Department appropriation bill. That can be done even now, if Members of the House are willing to forego speeches upon general subjects in general debate when these bills are under consideration. I venture this suggestion to our esteemed Speaker and to the majority leader, that opportunity be given to those Members, if there are any, who want to discuss matters outside of these appropriation bills, to discuss the President's message to-morrow and Thursday, prior to the introduction of the first appropriation bill, which will be that of the Treasury and Post Office Departments. I hope and expect that bill will be ready to be sent down to the printer to-morrow.

You are aware that it will take a day or two for the Clerk to figure up the final totals passed upon by the subcommittee and to get the bill back from the Public Printer and have it ready for report to the full committee. It may be possible to have that bill ready Friday. I hope it will be; but I want to assure the Members that the committee will sit at night, if necessary, and the clerks will work at night in order to bring that about. It may be Saturday before it can be ready. I simply wanted the House to know that your committee has been working earnestly, day and night, for over three weeks, in an effort to get these bills ready, and that you will have them at the first opportunity. If the way is clear, we can get three of those bills passed before Christmas; and if the Speaker and the leadership of the House decide to open the doors for debate on to-morrow and next day and prior to the introduction of this bill, I will take it as an indication not only that the leadership but that the membership of the House approves of the suggestion I have made, and I will ask unanimous consent that general debate upon those bills, when they come up, be limited to the subject matter of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BYRNS. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. For general information to the country, would the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations kindly state in round numbers how much the Congress in the last session cut below the President's Budget for 1933, and how much did Congress thus save for the people? How much below the President's Budget of 1933 were the supply bills?

Mr. BYRNS. The gentleman means at the last session?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.



Mr. BYRNS. Well, when we take into consideration the amount estimated to be saved by the economy bill it is something over \$334,000,000.

Mr. BLANTON. The President's Budget for each of the last three years amounted, in round numbers, to \$4,000,000,000.

Mr. BYRNS. More than that.

Mr. BLANTON. Four billion dollars a year.

Mr. BYRNS. More than that.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, I am speaking of the President's Budget proper, as he submitted it to Congress.

Mr. BYRNS. It was more than that.

Mr. BLANTON. Well, what are his Budget estimates for the year 1934?

Mr. BYRNS. I would prefer to wait until the President sends in his message before making such a statement. I have the facts, but I think the President should be permitted to speak on the subject first.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Tennessee has expired.

#### SESSIONS OF COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be permitted to sit during the sessions of Congress for the remainder of the session.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### CALENDAR WEDNESDAY

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday be dispensed with to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

HON. CLEMENT C. DICKINSON, REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for one minute in order to make an important announcement.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, to-day is the birthday of one of the fine and distinguished Members of this House, my colleague, Judge DICKINSON, of Missouri. He is 83 years old to-day. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, Judge DICKINSON is the oldest Member, in point of years, of the present Congress. He has served here for more than 20 years. Before that he served his county and his State with distinguished honor, and he is loved and respected by all Missourians, regardless of politics. [Applause, the Members rising.]

#### RESIGNATIONS FROM COMMITTEES

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

DECEMBER 6, 1932.

HON. JOHN N. GARNER,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

SIR: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Elections No. 3 of the House of Representatives.

Cordially yours,

HARRY A. ESTEP,  
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication:

DECEMBER 6, 1932.

HON. JOHN N. GARNER,

*Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.*

SIR: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Enrolled Bills of the House of Representatives.

Cordially yours,

HARRY A. ESTEP,  
*Member of Congress.*

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation is accepted.

There was no objection.

#### LEGISLATIVE MEDICINE

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the economic situation.

The SPEAKER. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LAMNECK. Mr. Speaker, some medicines relieve pain, others cure. That illustrates the difference between legislation only temporary in character as contrasted with legislation permanent in character.

What we want and need in this country is a confidence based on sound economic principle, social justice, equality of treatment for all groups, to the end that confidence may abide. To restore confidence upon a permanent basis we must have a definite, certain program that will not only be reassuring for to-day but to-morrow also. Industry, agriculture, and labor want to know what the future is to be. Suggested relief measures have not given that assurance. People are more optimistic, but still in doubt as to the final outcome of our present economic situation.

Patience, even greater patience, is needed, and the reward of patience must be definite legislation that will provide frugality of Government expenditure, balance between economic groups with profit for labor and capital wisely employed, and insure social peace and happiness. Confidence is the chief corner stone to any form of government, and with equal rights, equal justice, and equal opportunity constituting the other three, there is no reason why we should not proceed in an orderly fashion as a people to greater achievements than those already accomplished.

I have given considerable thought to our present unfortunate situation and the measures which, in my judgment, should relieve existing conditions and put us upon a sound basis. Every man, of course, has his own plan, and this results in much confusion. That is true in Congress. Various Members come forward with programs of their own.

I do not want to confuse or complicate the situation. On the contrary, I want to offer something which, in my firm belief, would be helpful to a favorable solution of the various problems now confronting this Nation. I shall touch briefly upon five subjects in the order of their importance as they occur to me. They are: Agriculture, industry, labor, taxes, and transportation.

#### AGRICULTURE

Most authorities will agree that there can be no prosperity unless agriculture is on a profitable basis. The farmer is the producer of a great proportion of new wealth. Also, he is one of the greatest consumers of the production of mine and factory. His importance, in the general scheme of things, is recognized and admitted. He is the key man to economic stability.

What a blessing it is that we are able to have an abundance of the products of the farm. Yet this abundance, or so-called surplus, has created a condition that tends to wreck the very foundation of the Nation. This surplus of farm products, we can not, and should not, permit to destroy, very largely, the value of the whole, which will ruin agriculture directly and every other business indirectly.

My efforts will be exerted to the control of the surplus products of the farm, as a means to restore agriculture to a normal situation, and place the farmer in a position to earn enough to again become a great consumer of the products in other lines of industry and this without putting the Government into the business or subsidizing with Government funds.

#### INDUSTRY

At no time in American history have industry and agriculture suffered the trials and tribulations through which they are now passing. The capacity of each to produce more than can be consumed is largely responsible. This results in unrestricted competition with no consideration

whatever given the cost of production, the loss of capital, or the effect upon labor.

Unrestricted competition of the kind, if permitted to run its course, will produce a situation where a standard of pay would be forced upon American labor that would not permit even a respectable existence.

That would not only be fatal to labor but likewise disastrous to industry in the certain depletion of capital and in no way in the public interest. Finally, dissolution would be the inevitable result in many lines of legitimate business.

The antitrust law, which was enacted to prevent monopoly and conspiracy in restraint of trade, has been wise and beneficial and should be maintained, but as the law not only permits but even encourages excessive competition, now generally known as cutthroat competition, which destroys capital, injures labor, and threatens industry itself, and constitutes the greatest restraint of trade that we have ever had, it should be so amended as to make possible the elimination or minimizing of this destructive force in the public interest.

#### LABOR

Industry, agriculture, and labor are so interdependent that they stand or fall together. One can not suffer without extreme hardship to the other. With industry and agriculture operated upon a proper basis, the problem of labor can be more readily solved.

Labor is entitled to a fair wage more than a living wage, just as industry and agriculture are entitled to a fair profit, which will permit an accumulation for the proverbial rainy day.

Our problem at this time is as much underconsumption as overproduction. The policy of some industries to reduce wages to a low standard feeds the depression, for the reason that it reduces the purchasing power of the people.

Our first duty is to seek to control and get the surplus products of farm and factory to moving out into the markets of the world. When this comes about the sunshine of prosperity will replace the gloom of despair.

#### TAXES

Taxes must be reduced in all Federal, State, and local governments. The extremely high taxes existing at the present time are eating at the very vitals of the Government. The proper solution of the tax question is one of the most important matters before the public.

The American people are tax-ridden beyond the power of endurance. To reduce governmental taxes means that there will have to be considerable change in our present governmental set-up. In other words, Government must get back to a solid foundation and confine its activities to governmental matters and not to interest in private enterprise. It is only by this method that we can materially reduce the expenses of government.

#### TRANSPORTATION

Our transportation problem is one of the greatest facing the American people. It has become a problem because unfair competition has made it so. The railroads, for instance, pay hundreds of millions of dollars, while competing companies pay little or nothing in taxes.

We must either remove the restrictions under which the railroads are now operating or place the same restrictions upon their competitors. Furthermore, the Government should not become a competitor in any respect with these companies, and any proposals with that in mind should be promptly and emphatically rejected.

Adequate and better railway systems are the greater need of the country to better serve the communities. They should be afforded such protection and such encouragement as would lead to greater expansion. They are a fixture because they are a necessity. Discriminations against them are unfair and unjust, not alone to the carriers but their employees and the public as well.

Of equal importance to any of these and all of these is the protection of the people in the exercise of their individual rights under the fundamental laws of the country. These rights have been abridged, ignored, and entirely forgotten in much legislation that has been enacted in this

country in the special interest of others. Under our Constitution every man is the equal of every other man. That is the way it should be if we are to have a democracy in reality as well as in name. The protection and restoration of these rights is one of the vital issues of the day, and should continue to be the issue until these matters are rightly settled in favor of the individual.

#### PHILIPPINE INDEPENDENCE DUE

Mr. OSIAS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks on Philippine independence in the RECORD by inserting an address delivered October 24, 1932, at Princeton University under the auspices of the School of Public and International Affairs.

There was no objection.

The address is as follows:

Mr. Chairman, members of the faculty and of the student body, you have done me honor in affording me this opportunity to discuss the problem closest and dearest to me before the constituency of Princeton University.

My subject is Philippine Independence Due. I wish frankly to state at the very outset that the conviction of the people whom I represent in Congress and of myself is that it is overdue and that its grant should be forthcoming without further delay. Assured that this is an audience desirous to know the truth and the facts, and university man that I am myself, I shall endeavor to be factual and dispassionate in the presentation of my thesis.

#### INTEREST IN PHILIPPINE QUESTION

There is to-day a widespread and increasing interest in the Philippine question. It has become a major American problem pressing for immediate action and satisfactory solution. The House of Representatives by the overwhelming vote of 306 to 47 passed a Philippine independence bill at its last session. The United States Senate voted to take up the measure on the 8th of December next.

That there should be a live interest in Philippine independence at Princeton is but natural, considering its historic and intimate relationship with the life of the former president of this great institution, the immortal Woodrow Wilson. As Chief Magistrate of the American Nation, he did much to bring the national ideal of the Filipino people nearer its realization. He it was who, in 1913, reiterated the assurance that the American people regard themselves "as trustees acting not for the advantage of the United States but for the benefit of the people of the Philippine Islands" and the formal pledge that every step to be taken "was with a view to the ultimate independence of the islands."

#### GEOGRAPHICAL FACTS

In order that our discussion may be intelligent and fruitful, let me furnish a little geographic and historical background.

The Philippines is a group of some 7,000 islands lying wholly in the Tropics southeast of the mainland of Asia. They are situated between 4° 40' and 21° 10' north latitude and 116° 40' and 124° 34' east longitude.

Manila is 7,164 miles from San Francisco, 6,923 miles from Seattle, 7,520 miles from Los Angeles, 14,533 miles from New York via Panama Canal, and 13,288 miles from New York via Suez Canal. The travel by boat from Manila to Seattle and by rail from Seattle to Washington is of 26 days' duration. It takes much less than half the time necessary for a journey from any point in the United States to the Philippines to reach London, Berlin, Madrid, Paris, or Constantinople. When it is 8 o'clock at night here or in the Capital of the United States it is 9 o'clock in the morning of the next day in the capital of the Philippines.

The land area of the country is over 114,400 square miles. In size thus the Philippines is larger than Switzerland, Denmark, Holland, Portugal, and Belgium put together. It is equal to all the New England States plus New York. About 67 per cent of the land area is comprised in the two largest islands, Luzon in the north and Mindanao in the south, and about 95 per cent of the land area is comprised in the 11 largest islands.

The climate of the Philippines is tropical. The average temperature in the lowlands is 79.5° F. The thermometer in most localities rarely registers below 70° or over 90°. In Baguio, a popular summer resort in the Mountain Province, the temperature during the year ranges from 50° to 75°. At night, even in the lowlands, it is invariably cool and pleasant and during the coolest months it is sometimes as low as 59° in Manila. The year is divided into two seasons, the dry season and the wet season.

With soil so fertile and with climate so favorable, agriculture is the basic industry. Rice, corn, sugarcane, coconuts, tobacco, hemp, rubber, all kinds of fruit trees, and vegetables are grown. With but about 13 per cent of the land area under cultivation there is great room for agricultural expansion.

The forestal wealth of the country is immense. It is the greatest single wealth of the Philippines. The stand of commercial timber is roughly estimated at 486,000,000,000 board feet. About 63 per cent of the vegetative area of the islands is commercial and noncommercial forest. This fact is indicative of the extent of hills and mountains.

The Philippines is endowed with rich and varied minerals, metallic and nonmetallic. Among the more important mines are



gold, silver, copper, lead, iron, zinc, manganese, sulphur, chromite, asbestos, and coal. The mining industry in the islands is in its infancy.

Another great source of wealth comes from the waters in and around the isles. Large rivers traverse the principal islands. Some of these are navigable. They are potential agencies to supply heat, fuel, and power and to help industrial development. There are lakes and streams which teem with fish. These and the seas and bays are fishing grounds. The field for development in the fishing industry and in the gathering of marine products like pearls, shells, trepang, and sponges, is almost limitless. (Miller and Polley, *Intermediate Geography*; Forbes, *The Philippine Islands*, vol. 1, ch. 1; Faustino, *The Natural Resources of the Philippine Islands*.)

The Philippines with its area and boundless resources is large and sufficient enough comfortably to be the home of fifty or sixty million. Its present population is 13,000,000.

#### HISTORICAL FACTS

Let me now present a few pertinent historical facts.

The rank and file of the people of the Philippines belong to the brown race, one of the five races of mankind. The bulk of our population is Malayan. Our ancestors migrated from the Malay Peninsula and Malay Archipelago. Those pioneering and adventurous Malayans braved the elements and in their frail barks called *barangay* crossed uncharted seas to establish settlements and build homes in a new country, styled by poets as the Pearl of the Orient Seas.

Before I pass on to other points I desire at this juncture to emphasize the fact that the Filipino people are racially homogeneous. If deemed necessary, I could adduce numerous authorities whose investigations and writings attest our racial solidarity.

Asiatic in its setting, the Philippines had extensive relations with oriental countries before having any contact with Europe. It had early dealings with Indo-China, China proper, India, Arabia, and neighboring islands of Malaysia.

Comparatively recent investigations have disclosed the fact that the Philippines formed a part of the empire Sri-Vishaya with Sumatra as its capital. From this Hindu-Malayan empire is derived the word *Visayas*, the name of the central group of islands in the Philippine Archipelago between the Luzon group and the Mindanao-Sulu group. This empire existed during the period from about the seventh to the fourteenth century of the Christian era. The grade of civilization which prevailed among the people of that empire may be partly gauged from "the use of a written language, metal weapons, coat armor, raft dwellings, and walled towns."

The decline of the Sri-Vishayan Empire was followed by the founding of the Empire of Madjapahit, which flourished during the last quarter of the fourteenth century. The Philippines was a part of this Javan Brahman Empire. (Steiger, Beyer, Benitez, *A History of the Orient*, chs. 9 and 14.)

With the break-up of the Empire of Madjapahit which terminated about the early part of the fifteenth century the Philippines came in contact with Arabia through Arab traders and missionaries. Islamism began to spread in Malaysia in the fourteenth century. To the period from 1380 to 1450 "belongs the Mohammedan invasion of the Archipelago." (Saleeby, *Studies in Moro History, Law, and Religion*, ch. 3.)

The early contacts of the inhabitants of the Philippines with their various oriental neighbors exerted lasting influence upon their commercial, social, political, cultural, and spiritual life.

After these bare statements of oriental relationships of the Philippines we shall point out the next important development, the impact of western influence. Ordinary readers of things Philippine begin centuries late. They start with the information that Magellan discovered the Philippines on March 16, 1521.

The chapter of Philippine history which deals with Spanish-Filipino relations in the sixteenth century really dates back to the issuance of the bulls by Pope Alexander VI in 1493 establishing the Line of Demarcation, modified by the treaty signed by the representatives of the Spanish and Portuguese monarchs June 7, 1494, at the city of Tordesillas. (Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, vol. 1, pp. 97-129.)

Out of these grew the extension of the imperial sway of the two kingdoms of the Iberian Peninsula over the seas until they embraced almost the whole world. The extraordinary activities of Portugal and Spain during the latter part of the fifteenth century and the sixteenth century in the discovery and conquest of lands in the eastern world served to check the expansion of the Mohammedan empire, which was fast extending into the Malaysian region.

Twenty years passed after Magellan's discovery in 1521, before serious attempts were made by Spain to secure possession of the Philippines. Several expeditions, ostensibly for such a purpose, were undertaken. The expedition of Loaisa in 1525, of Saavedra in 1527, and of Villalobos in 1543 did not succeed in effecting the conquest of, or establishing any settlement in, the archipelago, which began to be referred to as *Las Filipinas* in honor of the new king, Felipe II. (Blair and Robertson, *The Philippine Islands*, vol. 2, pp. 25-73.)

King Philip II wanted the colonization of the Philippines. He commanded the viceroy of New Spain, as Mexico was then called, to prepare a fleet for an expedition as early as 1559. This materialized five years later. On November 21, 1564, the fleet of four vessels set sail from Navidad, Mexico, under the command of Miguel Lopez de Legaspi, assisted by Friar Andres de Urdaneta as "spiritual leader and chief navigator." (Fernandez, *History of the Philippines*, ch. 3; Blair and Robertson, v. 2, pp. 196-216.)

The fleet anchored near Cebu on February 13, 1565. Legaspi, bent on the conquest of the Philippines, found the islanders hostile. Urdaneta objected to the colonization of the islands because he thought they belonged to Portugal and because the warrant of the Augustinian authorities in Mexico emphasized his spiritual mission "of leading peoples to embrace the faith" so that "the most brilliant light of faith may beam upon the populous races that dwell in that region of the world." The warrant further continues in its characteristic language: "Through the benignity of God, most holy and supreme, and your preaching, there is hope that those benighted barbarians may cast aside the errors and more than Cimmerian darkness of idolatry for the splendor of the gospel; and that they who so long unacquainted with gospel truth have been groping in the gloom of satanic bondage may now at last, through the grace of Christ, the common savior of all men, gaze at the full light of truth in their knowledge of His name." (Blair and Robertson, v. 7, p. 162.)

The first Spanish settlement in the Philippines was that of Cebu in 1565. From that year on the task of conquest through the combined agencies of the cross and the sword was vigorously pushed. Legaspi founded Manila, the capital of the archipelago, in 1571. The expedition of Legaspi and Urdaneta inaugurated the Spanish rule of the Philippine Islands, which lasted for more than 300 long years.

To complete the recital of a few outstanding historical facts let me say that a number of revolutions took place in the Philippines during the Spanish occupation. These were for purposes of reform and later for separation and absolute freedom. The most successful was the revolution of 1896, which resulted in the establishment of the Philippine Republic. That government was republican in form and had for its basis a written constitution vesting power and authority in the people. That document was "voted, decreed, and sanctioned" at Malolos by "the representatives of the Filipino people." (English text in hearings before the Committee on the Philippines, United States Senate and the Committee on Insular Affairs, House of Representatives, 1919, pp. 41-50.)

"The newly promulgated instrument," says Fernandez, a Filipino historian, "proclaimed that 'the political association of all Filipinos' constituted a 'nation' called the Philippine Republic, the sovereignty of which resided exclusively in the people. It defined the government of the Republic, which was declared 'free and independent,' as one that should be 'popular, representative, alternative, and responsible,' and exercised 'by three distinct powers, called the legislative, the executive, and the judicial.'" (Fernandez, *The Philippine Republic*, pp. 144-145.)

We next come to the war waged by the United States against Spain in 1898; the order of April 25, cabled Commodore Dewey, who was at Hong Kong, to "proceed to the Philippine Islands, commence operations at once against Spanish fleet, capture vessels or destroy"; the Battle of Manila Bay and the triumph of American arms; the capitulation of Manila; and the entry of American forces into the Walled City on August 13, 1898, the date American occupation began in the Philippines. The treaty of peace ending the state of war was signed by the representatives of the United States and Spain in Paris, December 10, 1898. By that instrument "Spain ceded to the United States the archipelago known as the Philippine Islands."

Lack of understanding between Americans and Filipinos, the implantation of American control, and the thwarting of the Filipinos' plan for a Philippine republic, free and independent, the objective for which they fought and sacrificed in many revolutions against the previous régime, led to the unfortunate American-Filipino War, which lasted more than three years. When peace was restored and America gave assurance that it was her policy "not to exploit but to develop" and to bring to the Philippines "the richest blessings of a liberating rather than a conquering nation," an era of cooperation was inaugurated which had continued during the last three decades.

#### COLONIAL RULE AND INDEPENDENCE

It would be helpful now to indulge in retrospection to make clear the persistency and continuity of the Filipinos' struggle for freedom and independence.

Chroniclers of the early Spanish régime have recorded the opposition of the Filipinos to foreign rule. In fact, there stands to-day in the little isle of Mactan, where he died, a monument to Magellan which is a reminder of the intrepidity of that great navigator and of the battle fought by our ancestors against his exaction of tribute and demand that they acknowledge a new sovereignty.

With full acknowledgment of the good that Spain has done—the establishment of schools and colleges numbering over 2,000 when the American flag was first unfurled in the Philippines; the roads, bridges, and public improvements; the organization of social and political units; the advance such as it was in the agricultural and economic life of the country; and, above all, the introduction of western culture and the implantation of Christianity—it is necessary to state that there were many abuses, excesses, and impositions which were irksome and intolerable. The last century of Spanish colonial rule was a bloody one. The Filipinos resorted to all means to institute reforms with little or no avail. The rulers and colonizers, drunk with power, became greedy and ruthless and ignored their original purposes, couched in the most sublime and humanitarian terms.

Apolinario Mabini, patriot and thinker, one of the brains of the revolution of 1896, spoke accurately and with moderation when he said:



"The ostensible object of the conquest was the propagation of Catholicism, to rescue the heathens from the clutches of barbarism and of the devil and make them coparticipants in the benefits of civilization and of life everlasting. No purpose could have been more disinterested and generous. But as the conquerors had to risk the perils of the seas then unknown and contend with savage forces and climes to which they were unaccustomed, the sole object of doing good to an unknown folk was not nor is an inducement sufficient to inspire the general run of men for enterprises of this kind. Of necessity there had to be a more positive motive, another object covert but more real, like the love of riches. The gold of America had awakened the covetousness of adventurous spirits. Besides, the conquest of new territories has always meant extension of property, increase in wealth. By teaching their religion and customs to the natives, the conquerors could dominate them body and soul and subdue them better to secure from them the greatest possible gain. Whether warriors, priests, or merchants, conquerors have gone and will go ever after material riches and although making loud protestations of humanitarianism, they will not practice it except as a means of securing their chief objective." (Mabini, *La Revolución Filipina*, edited by T. M. Kalaw, vol. 2, p. 279.)

When it is borne in mind that a colonial venture undertaken for the missionary purpose of spreading the Christian faith should have ended so tragically, we are led to wonder whether greed is not inherent in all colonial enterprises!

The irrefutable fact in the case of the Spanish rule in the Philippines, especially toward its closing years, is that there have been so many cruelties and injustices, so much carnage and bloodshed, climaxed by the execution of José Rizal, the greatest Filipino patriot and martyr, on December 30, 1896. By that time a veritable lake of blood had formed as an impassable chasm between the nationals and their rulers. From that day on the Filipino people, with increasing intensity, have had for their supreme aspiration the complete freedom and the absolute independence of their fatherland beloved.

#### AMERICA AND ORIENTAL TRADE

Let us now pass in review America's interest in Asia.

Tyler Dennett, in "a critical study of the policy of the United States" with reference to the Far East entitled "Americans in Eastern Asia," maintains that trade is the foundation of American policy in Asia. "Where trade was free," this author writes, "there was no policy. Where trade was a policy its weight was in direct ratio to the desire of the Americans for the trade" (p. 69). Speaking of the annexation of Hawaii, he says: "At that time (1842) the American interest in the islands arose out of their value to the Pacific and trans-Pacific trade, particularly to the American whalers in the North Pacific which found at Honolulu a convenient place to refit" (p. 609).

In connection with his treatment of the Philippines he quotes the following declaration of McKinley: "Incidental to our tenure of the Philippines is the commercial opportunity to which American statesmanship can not be indifferent. It is just to use every legitimate means for the enlargement of American trade. . . . The commercial opportunity which is naturally and inevitably associated with this new opening depends less on large territorial possessions than upon an adequate commercial basis and upon broad and equal privileges." Anent this declaration, Dennett makes this significant comment: "This, the first use in an American document of the 'open-door' phrase, established the connection between McKinley's Chinese and Philippines policies. A fortuitous concurrence of events had brought within American grasp the very expedient which Commodore Perry and Dr. Peter Parker had urged in 1853 and 1857. Manila might become the equivalent of Hong Kong and the leased ports of China, for the lack of which American trade and interests in the Far East were, in the summer of 1898, in serious prospective if not present embarrassment." (P. 622.) Another writer on far eastern problems, Hornbeck, discussing America's open-door policy, says: "With the acquisition of the Philippines the Republican administration became suddenly enthusiastic over the possibilities of American commercial expansion in the Pacific." (Politics in the Far East, pp. 231-232.)

It is not, of course, to be understood that commercial advantage was the sole motive for American administration of Philippine affairs for did not McKinley insist on "the necessity for taking Cuba, not only on the grounds of humanity and civilization, but to assure peace . . . ?" (Millis, *The Martial Spirit*, p. 374.) Did not Secretary Hay telegraph this message to Mr. Day, in Paris, on October 28, 1898: "It is imperative upon us that as victors we should be governed only by motives which will exalt our Nation. Territorial expansion should be our least concern; that we shall not shirk the moral obligations of our victory is of the greatest . . . . The sentiment in the United States is almost universal that the people of the Philippines, whatever else is done, must be liberated from Spanish domination." (Papers relating to the treaty with Spain, S. Doc. No. 148, 56th Cong., 2d sess., p. 37.) And did not the Government of the United States make solemn and formal avowal in a legislative enactment that "it was never the intention of the people of the United States in the incipency of the war with Spain to make it a war of conquest or for territorial aggrandizement"?

The Filipinos have placed reliance on the sense of right and justice on the part of the Government and people of the United States these 30 and more years. Their fathers cherished the belief that definite action on their national emancipation must be in the offing. The people and their authorized spokesmen to-day are keeping the faith.

#### TWO ESTABLISHED FACTS

Fortunately for both the American and Filipino peoples the solution of the problem can be approached without recrimination and in the spirit of amity. The Filipinos' ability to govern themselves is no longer questioned. The sincerity of their demand for independence is no longer impugned. There is a greater disposition on the part of proponents and opponents of definite independence measures to recognize that the present uncertainty is harmful to American and Filipino interests and should be removed, and that the temporary political status of the Philippines should be altered and placed upon a permanent basis. It is natural, of course, that there should be honest differences of opinion in matters of detail both in the United States and in the Philippine Islands on the concrete legislative measure to achieve these desirable ends. It is at once the strength and the inefficiency of democracies that individuals may disagree and yet be agreed in their pursuit of a common objective.

There are a number of points involved in American-Filipino relationship which are not debatable, but two facts deserve emphasis because they are basic in satisfactorily effecting a righteous settlement. These are (1) the formal promise of Philippine independence by the United States, and (2) the strong and united aspiration of the Filipino people to be free and independent. (Osias's testimony in hearing before House of Representatives Committee on Insular Affairs, 1932, pp. 355-357.)

The fact of American promise of the grant of Philippine independence is established. It is a definite commitment. It is the fundamental policy of America in temporarily administering Philippine affairs at the very incipency of civil government under the American régime.

Senator VANDENBERG on the floor of the Senate declared: "There is no doubt in my mind about the obligation of the American people in this respect. No one can deny the obligation. . . . Congress indisputably has led the Filipinos to believe that they are to have their independence as soon as a stable government is established. The promise, furthermore, is written into numerous pronouncements by both Republican and Democratic Presidents of the United States." The present administration has admitted that "Independence of the Philippines at some time has been directly or indirectly promised by every President and by the Congress."

In the light of this admission it is not necessary to recite executive pronouncements, party declarations, and congressional statements bearing on America's formal and solemn pledge. (Hawes, *Philippine Uncertainty*, ch. 8, Roxas, *American Policy Toward the Philippines*, in hearings before the House Committee on Insular Affairs, 1932, pp. 17-21; Osias, *America's Promise of Philippine Independence*.)

Another important and indisputable fact is that the Filipino people vehemently and unitedly desire the early grant of their national independence. In war and in peace under the Spanish and American rules the Filipinos have demonstrated convincing proofs that such is their national determination.

The revolution of 1896 against Spain, to mention no others, was fought for liberty and independence.

Mabini in 1899, while the American-Philippine war was in progress, said: "The Filipino people fight and will fight in defense of their liberty and independence with the same tenacity and perseverance which they have demonstrated in suffering. Their unalterable faith in the justice of their cause inspires them." (*La Revolución Filipina*, v. 2, p. 38.)

Philippine political parties advocate "immediate, absolute, and complete independence" in their platforms. (*Plataforma y Reglamento del Partido Nacionalista Consolidado*, 1924, p. 7; *Partido Democrata, Plataforma y Programa de Gobierno*, 1924, p. 2.) In 1926 the two parties formed a coalition to labor for independence "with greater vigor and efficacy" and so that the Filipinos may the better assume "a common and undivided responsibility." (*Constitución y Reglamento del Consejo Supremo Nacional*, 1926, pp. 4-5.)

The municipal councils, the provincial boards, and the Philippine Legislature approved numerous resolutions officially petitioning the Congress and the President of the United States for the early grant of independence. (Hearings, United States Senate Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs, 1930, pp. 488-528.)

In February, 1930, "on the initiative of private citizens," an independence congress was held in Manila, "composed of representatives of business and agriculture, directors of civic organizations, leaders in the various professions, publicists, educators, laborers, religious and student leaders, municipal presidents, Moro chiefs, coworkers of Rizal and Del Pilar in Spain, veterans of the revolution, elective officials of the provincial governments, high officials of the former Philippine Republic, past and present members of the Philippine Legislature, and Filipino members of the Council of State; after deliberating upon the problems of independence, including national defense, finance, and economics, as well as political, social, and educational questions which would be faced by an independent Philippines," reached the conclusion that "we are convinced that immediate independence is the only solution in consonance with the unalterable desires of the Filipino people." (*Independence Congress Proceedings*, pp. 324-325; M. M. Kalaw, *The Philippine Question*, pp. 9-18.)

The different resident commissioners from the Philippines and the various Philippine independence missions to the United States have all pleaded for immediate independence before the Government and people of the United States.

Every elected official in the islands from the President of the Philippine Senate to the last councilor of a municipality is



elected on an independence plank. It is no exaggeration to say that no one against independence could be elected to an office necessitating popular suffrage.

An emissary of President Coolidge sent to the Philippines, Carmi Thompson, on his return reported that "all Filipinos who are interested in public affairs are openly for independence. . . . I believe that practically the entire voting population is for independence."

Senator HAWES noted the universality of the sentiment when he made an extensive visit to the Philippines in 1931. In the informing book which he subsequently wrote, he says: "Every class and condition of Filipinos desires independence. Abundant attestation of that fact I found on my visit to the islands." (Philippine Uncertainty, pp. 196-197.)

A student of world affairs and not engaged in politics corroborates the foregoing testimony. Sherwood Eddy says in a recent volume from his pen: "The Filipinos desire independence, as we have seen, probably more unanimously than any other subject people in the world." (The Challenge of the East, p. 180.)

It is clear from the foregoing discussion that the grant of independence would be the fulfillment of a sacred pledge honorably made by the United States and the satisfaction of an age-long aspiration so universally coveted by the people of the Philippines.

#### THE ECONOMIC FACTOR

But independence is an ideal whose consummation is anxiously awaited, not alone for sentimental or idealistic reasons. It is desired for practical reasons, or, if you please, on the grounds of enlightened selfishness. In America independence legislation is urged not only by those animated by disinterested, altruistic, and humanitarian motives but by "selfish interests," as expressed by an American writer, "without criticism, express or implied."

There is no blinking the fact that from the ranks of such "selfish interests" came the most stubborn, systematic, and effective opposition to independence for a number of years. "Opposing independence," says Senator HAWES, "will be found: (1) The 'Manila-American' group . . . ; (2) bureaucrats who fear the loss of their positions or the curtailment of our governmental activities in the islands; (3) some American manufacturers who have found in the islands a free market for their products; (4) importers of Philippine products, which are not taxed under tariff laws as similar products from other countries are; and (5) Americans who have investments in the islands." (Philippine Uncertainty, p. 222.) Imperialism and trade have played a great rôle in the delay of favorable action on independence. (Reyes, Legislative History of America's Economic Policy Toward the Philippines.)

Strangely enough, especially in the last few years, economic factors have strengthened the movement for Philippine independence in the United States. The American Federation of Labor, the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Beet Growers' Association, the National Grange, the National Cooperative Milk Association, the Farmers' Union, the National Dairy Union, the railroad brotherhoods, the Southern Tariff Association, some local chambers of commerce, and other individuals and entities have come forward strongly favoring legislation granting Philippine independence at the earliest possible date. These, together with other elements who for a long time believed it unjust to withhold independence, have aided us materially in bringing the issue to a head.

Since the economic factor can not be ignored, and since it is alleged by the opponents that independence would bring "economic chaos" to the Philippines, it is well to analyze this phase of the question in some detail.

The beginning of American-Philippine tariff relations was governed by the treaty of peace between the United States and Spain which included the following provision:

"ARTICLE IV. The United States will, for the term of 10 years from the date of the exchange of the ratifications of the present treaty, admit Spanish ships and merchandise to the ports of the Philippine Islands on the same terms as ships and merchandise of the United States."

At the expiration of the 10-year period from April 11, 1899, a unique trade arrangement erroneously referred to as "reciprocal free trade" between the United States and the Philippines was effected by the enactment of the Payne-Aldrich bill of 1909. The so-called free-trade proposition was opposed by the Philippine Assembly because "free trade between the United States and the islands would in the future become highly prejudicial to the economic interests of the Filipino people and would bring about a situation which might hinder the attainment of independence." The Filipino leaders then placed the independence of the people above trade advantages and foresaw the economic dislocation which its discontinuance would bring about with the grant of independence. The American authorities in Manila and the Congress, however, imposed the arrangement which the Filipinos opposed. By the law passed American goods were admitted free of duty to the Philippines, but important limitations were placed upon Philippine products entering the American market. Quantity limitations were placed upon sugar and tobacco. Another limitation was placed upon Philippine products containing 20 per cent or more of foreign material. No limitation of any kind was placed upon American products, so that the so-called free trade was really unilateral and from that day to this never really reciprocal.

With the enactment of the Underwood-Simmons tariff law of 1913 part of the glaring injustice of the tariff was removed by

the elimination of the limit in the amount of sugar and tobacco authorized to enter the United States free of duty. The 20 per cent foreign material provision was not eliminated. American products of every kind and description and in unlimited quantities continued to be admitted free of duty.

Virtually the same general tariff arrangement was maintained in the Fordney-McCumber tariff law of 1922 and the Hawley-Smoot Tariff Act of 1930. During the Seventy-first Congress there was great agitation by American interests to place a duty or limitation upon Philippine products, especially coconut oil and sugar. I had several occasions to fight against such iniquitous proposals in committees and on the floor of Congress. The very first speech I delivered in Congress had to do with our tariff relations against "the proposed imposition of duty or placing limitations upon Philippine products coming into this country while American goods going to the Philippines are absolutely free and without limit" and while the American flag waved over the islands. (Speech in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, May 25, 1929; statement before Senate Finance Committee, July 16, 1929, pp. 262-279.)

To be truthful and accurate, it should be said that the Philippines made great material progress during her relationship with the United States, and the people are appreciative of America's contribution. But the United States likewise benefited, as shown by the fact that her trade and commerce in the Orient increased by 400 per cent and in the Philippines 1,200 per cent. (Osias, Trade Relations between the United States and the Philippine Islands in a Billion Potential Customers, v. 2, pp. 29-35.)

From the Report of the Insular Collector of Customs for 1930—and I chose this year, being more typical than 1931—we learn that the total foreign trade of the islands "dropped from ₱623,214,234 in 1929 to ₱512,520,162 in 1930, or a decrease of ₱110,694,072," and that the total trade with the United States amounted to over ₱367,050,179, the amount of ₱156,366,057 representing imports and ₱210,684,122 representing exports.

With full knowledge of the mutual benefits that have accrued from our trade relations, the Filipinos at the same time are not unmindful of the precariousness of their uncertain status, their lack of power and authority in matters of tariff between the United States and their country, the harm that would come with the extension of American coastwise laws, and the utter impossibility of stability in their economic life while their political status is undetermined.

To the allegation that with independence there will inevitably be economic chaos, we answer, "No." We may admit that there will be some economic dislocation, yet we want our independence, for we can stand the shock better if it comes soon rather than if it is long delayed; we are powerless to effect economic treaties with other countries while we are dependent; we are not happy nor safe to be enmeshed in America's economic system without a real voice in the determination of governmental policies; we are without real authority now to legislate on our tariff, our mines, our forests, and our public domain so essential to our economic life; and we better start placing ourselves in a position to compete on a world basis so that we may thereby effect our economic stability on a permanent basis.

One of the largest sugar producers of the Philippines, Mr. Rafael Alunan, secretary of agriculture and natural resources, made a significant statement last month when he said: "Were I asked to choose between the proposed limitation of 850,000 tons embodied in the two bills now pending in Congress and the immediate termination of free trade and the consequent full application of the American tariff, I would, without hesitation, choose the latter, if accompanied by independence. For an independent Philippine government will be free to make arrangements with other countries for the marketing of our sugar." (Philippines Herald, September 8, 1932, p. 12.) This frank declaration of a man engaged in the industry which will be affected most adversely by the grant of independence pleases me immensely, because I have always been more interested in our national freedom than in temporary material advantage.

Let me say here and now that independence can not come too soon for me. I would like it to come advantageously if possible or with the least disturbance to the economic life of my people, but I unhesitatingly declare that an independent existence is the best for the Philippines with all the attendant risks and difficulties, burdens and responsibilities.

#### THE ONLY PREREQUISITE

After a rather disproportionate attention given to the material phase of the question, it is well to recall at this juncture the only condition precedent upon the grant of independence. In the Philippine autonomy act passed by Congress and approved by the President in 1916 it was clearly stated. It was unequivocally proclaimed to the world that "it is as it has always been, the purpose of the people of the United States to withdraw their sovereignty over the Philippine Islands and to recognize their independence as soon as a stable government can be established therein."

Did the Filipino people comply with the only prerequisite exacted? We have it on the authority of a President of the United States that they did. President Wilson in his message to Congress in 1920 certified to their compliance thus:

"Allow me to call your attention to the fact that the people of the Philippine Islands have succeeded in maintaining a stable government since the last action of the Congress in their behalf and have thus fulfilled the condition set by the Congress as precedent to a consideration of granting independence to the islands. I respectfully submit that the condition precedent having been fulfilled it is now our liberty and our duty to keep



our promise to the people of those islands by granting them the independence which they so honorably covet."

Twelve years have elapsed since this authoritative certification, but the promise remains unredeemed.

This year the House Committee on Insular Affairs held exhaustive hearings on the Philippine question and after thoughtful consideration of the evidence presented decided favorably to report out the Hare bill (H. R. 7233) which was passed on April 4, 1932, by the House of Representatives by one of the largest majorities in legislative history. In the committee's official report recognition was made of the "lofty purpose of the United States . . . to grant independence to the Philippines." The report added: "The only condition precedent imposed by the Congress was the establishment of a stable government. It is believed that a stable government now exists in the Philippines, that is, a government capable of maintaining order, administering justice, performing international obligations, and supported by the suffrage of the people."

#### UNEXPLAINABLE INACTION

The Filipino representatives have from time to time appeared before appropriate committees and officials to present a factual record of progress made in the Philippines. During the Seventy-first and Seventy-second Congresses they submitted facts and figures at the comprehensive hearings held by the Senate and House committees demonstrative of their preparedness. The records contain evidence of their social and cultural preparedness, the stability of the Philippine currency, the balanced budget of the government, which, by the way, has been self-supporting since 1901, and the governmental experience and political readiness of the Filipinos to guide their own ship of state. After an investigation and study of all phases of the Philippine problem a distinct advance, the greatest in the course of our emancipatory struggles, was made. For the first time both the Senate committee and the House committee actually reported out concrete independence measures. (H. Rept. No. 806, 72d Cong., 1st sess.; S. Rept. No. 354, 72d Cong., 1st sess.) For the first time, too, the House of Representatives actually voted and passed an independence bill, known as the Hare bill. The House bill was sent to the Senate, the Senate committee approved it with amendment substituting the Hawes-Cutting bill, brought it on the floor several times for discussion, postponed action till December.

In the light of the fulfillment of the only condition required there are naturally a number of people, Americans and Filipinos, disappointed and discouraged by the repeated delays. In bewilderment many in the islands are asking: Why this apathy, this indifference, this passivity? They are heartened somewhat by the favorable House action, by the definite recognition by the Congress that the Filipinos "are now ready for independence politically, socially, and economically," and by the expectation of definite action in the Senate at the early part of the coming session.

#### THE BILL—DIFFERENCES OF OPINION—CONFLICT OF INTERESTS

The House independence bill, H. R. 7233, provides authorization for a constitutional convention to frame a constitution for a more autonomous government of the commonwealth to be created, its submission to the President of the United States and the Filipino people, quantity limitations on Philippine products duty free until complete independence is granted, the amounts fixed being 850,000 tons for sugar, 200,000 tons for coconut oil, and 3,000,000 pounds for cordage, regulation of Philippine immigration fixing a maximum annual quota of 50, the withdrawal of American sovereignty and the grant of absolute independence after eight years, the reservation, at America's discretion, of military and naval bases, and the tariff duties to be levied after independence. The bill pending in the Senate contains amendments lengthening the period from 8 to 15 years, providing for a plebiscite, recognition of American authority, and a graduated tariff levy after the first 10 years, etc.

Lately there have been dispatches, news items, and articles in the American press tending to convey to the American public the idea that "Filipinos are opposed to the freedom bill," because criticisms have been leveled at Filipino leaders, and because objections have been raised against certain provisions of the Hare bill or the Hawes-Cutting bill in the islands.

Need I explain that Filipino political leaders are no more immune from criticism than are American political leaders? Who among the prominent candidates in the United States during this presidential campaign is spared from criticism and even vilification?

There are bound to be differences of opinion when you translate a great idea or principle into action. Right now you have an excellent example in this country regarding the tariff. One group rallies around the principle of protective tariff, and another group around the principle of competitive tariff. Now, if you translate these principles into legislative action in Congress you will find opinions clashing, and among the very people who at one time marched under the same banner there will be all shades of opinion representing varying degrees of "protectiveness" or "competitiveness" of tariff rates.

In the case of the Hare bill and the Hawes-Cutting bill, it would be a miracle if there were unanimity of opinion among Americans and Filipinos. There are conflicting interests involved. The Filipino labor elements, for example, would prefer no limitation on immigration, while American labor elements want restriction and even exclusion. The Americans and Filipinos who have invested in the Philippine sugar industry would prefer no limitation or a limitation not less than one million or a million and a half

tons, while the sugar interests in the United States would want that figure as low as possible or a tax on every pound that enters the American market. The same would be true with oil or cordage. And the time? The Filipinos, by and large, would want independence immediately; the "Manila Americans" want it delayed at least 30 years, and some would not want it granted at all.

Of course, the Filipinos are not satisfied with each and every provision of the pending bill. It is not absolutely in conformity with the desires of the authors themselves nor with mine. Neither the Hare bill nor the Hawes-Cutting bill came out of the committees as it was originally presented. Mr. HARE would have preferred a shorter period, and so would Senator HAWES or Senator CUTTING. I know Mr. HARE would have liked it better if the time were five years. But although he is chairman, there are 20 others in his committee, some favoring 5 years or less, others favoring 10 or 15 or 20 years, and 1 or 2 even longer. And there are other provisions on which he had to yield. I, too, know that Senator HAWES is not wholly satisfied with the bill as reported by the committee. But anyone who works with a committee of 15 Senators knows that he can not have his way entirely. The excellent bill of Senator KING, a member of the Senate committee who valiantly and disinterestedly has been fighting for Philippine independence for a number of years, received only 2 votes. The Senator from Missouri, who has given of his time and talent without stint to this great cause of human freedom, said last year: "There may be honest differences of opinion as to whether independence should be given in 5, 7, or 10 years, but the proposal to delay decision for 15 or 20 or 30 years is not a plan; it is a subterfuge."

If the Filipino leaders or I were to have our way, the time would be shortened, the economic provisions liberalized and made reciprocal, and certain other features removed. Those who are imbued with the generous period accorded Spain's ships and merchandise in the treaty of Paris, including Aguinaldo, contemplate the grant of independence immediately after which "readjustment of free-trade relations should come," must realize that in the interplay of "selfish factors" this finds no cordial reception among those who have the power of decision. The plan that has gained acceptance and holds promise of becoming a law is not one that means abrupt termination, but one that provides certain steps, processes, and mechanism to be put into operation after which complete independence will eventuate. (H. R. Committee Report No. 806, pp. 2, 12.)

After years of unremitting labor for our national emancipation, it seems to me the part of wisdom and prudence for all to face the cold facts of reality and for the Filipino people and their representatives to be prepared for sacrifices and bend their best effort and energy toward securing definite action on a measure that embodies the best and most liberal terms to the end that the independence we so dearly cherish come on a fixed and early date.

The period of theoretical discussion, I hope, is passed. I trust we have entered upon the last stage of concrete action. That action should come definitely and soon so that the Filipinos who have trusted America may not be plunged into disillusionment, despair, and desperation and so that America herself may not rue the day when, because of the apathy or self-complacency of those clothed with power and responsibility, she may be subjected to the charge of premeditated delay.

#### EXCUSE FOR INACTION

I have been in the thick of the fight for independence for several years and I have been fairly amazed by the arguments or excuses in favor of inaction. At one time, when all was peace in the Orient, we had to contend with the excuse that no action on the Philippine question should be taken because it might disturb the equilibrium of the East. At another time when the nonwithdrawal of American sovereignty over the Philippines did not after all insure equilibrium, the new situation was again utilized as an excuse for inaction. The Senate committee acted wisely when it refused to give weight to "the varying fortunes of conflicting forces on the other side of the Pacific . . . as an excuse for delaying the solution of our problems," reaching the sound conclusion that "the fulfillment of our (America's) duty toward the Philippines must be determined upon the basis of the welfare of the people of the United States and the 13,000,000 people of the Philippine Islands."

As regards the international phase of this question, there are two camps of thought in the United States to consider: First, there are those who are averse to America's involving herself in foreign entangling alliances, and, secondly, those who have faith in the peace pacts renouncing war as an instrument of national policy and resorting to pacific means in the settlement or solution of international disputes or conflicts.

Either view really argues for Philippine independence. Those who wish to see America avoid entangling alliances in Europe, to be consistent, must favor her extricating herself from entanglements in the Far East. Those who believe in the sacredness of treaties must see world safety in peace. The United States, in the Root treaties of 1907, in the Taft treaties of 1910, in the Bryan treaties and the Kellogg-Briand treaties, has shown unmistakably her determination to build up a sentiment of peace and the observance of the principle of peace in international relations. World opinion has made the declaration of independence from war against the old practice based upon a code of war.

There will be risk, of course, in independence. Of that the Filipinos are fully conscious. But for that matter there is risk in their present status. History holds to them the promise that



the visitations of great wars come not oftener than once in an active lifetime. Be the cross ever so heavy if it means redemption.

The outstanding fact about the Filipino people is that they have irrevocably made their determination to be free and independent. They have set their heart and mind and soul upon independence as the crowning glory of their earthly existence. They are justly entitled to it. The power and authority to decide rest with the United States. My people are still strong in the faith and expectation that America will decide soon and aright.

#### GAINS WITH GRANT OF INDEPENDENCE

By the early grant of independence to the Philippine Islands great gains will be reaped by America, the Philippines, and the world.

#### AMERICA'S GAINS

Granting independence to the Philippines early and upon terms just and righteous, America's will be the glory of honorably fulfilling a promise solemnly made. Americans will experience that happiness which comes from the solid satisfaction of having successfully terminated their colonial venture in the Orient. The fear of menace from Philippine competition entertained by American farmers will be removed. The demands of American labor for the restriction of Filipino immigration will be satisfactorily met. The greatest source of military and naval weakness to the United States will be eliminated. Economy to the taxpayers and simplification of governmental machinery can be effected. Greater confidence in the Government and people of the United States will be created throughout the Orient, where dwell a billion of potential customers.

#### PHILIPPINE GAINS

To the Filipino people the grant of independence will mean the satisfaction of their highest national aspiration. It will remove the uncertainty with its benumbing effect upon our economic progress. It will place the instruments of our economic salvation in our hands. It will result in the approval of a constitution of our own creation and which will give unity to our legal system and jurisprudence. It will make for better orientation in our social and educational development, for it will enable us to have a definite type of citizenship which we are denied under a dependent status. It will make for greater self-reliance and initiative. It will give us control and direction in our individual and institutional life. It will release our intellectual and spiritual powers for creative achievements. It will enable us to determine our own standards of life and conduct deemed most conducive to the well-being and happiness of the people of the Philippine Islands.

#### WORLD GAINS

Philippine independence will likewise result in gains for the world because it will enhance understanding and friendship between the East and the West. It will be a deathblow to imperialism and the reign of greed. It will deepen faith in a world suffering from doubt and fear. It will make the Philippines a concrete laboratory for harmonizing the best in oriental and occidental civilizations. It will be a demonstration of the efficacy of justice, right, and idealism in international and interracial dealings. It will be a contribution to world peace for America, and the Philippines will have shown that freedom and independence may be achieved not through war or bloodshed but absolutely through peace agencies and constitutional processes.

#### JUSTICE

The Filipinos' appeal for independence is an appeal for plain and simple justice. Will America heed our just petition? We believe the hour has struck for America to discharge her moral obligation.

#### MEMBERSHIP OF COMMITTEES

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I offer a resolution, which I send to the desk, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

#### House Resolution 309

Resolved, That the following Members be, and they are hereby, elected members of the standing committees of the House of Representatives, to wit:

HARRY A. ESTEP, of Pennsylvania, to the Committee on Ways and Means.

JOSEPH F. BIDDLE, of Pennsylvania, to the Committees on Coinage, Weights, and Measures; Revision of the Laws; and Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

ROBERT L. DAVIS, of Pennsylvania, to the Committees on the District of Columbia, and Public Buildings and Grounds.

HOWARD W. STULL, of Pennsylvania, to the Committee on the Census.

The resolution was agreed to.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 56 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, December 7, 1932, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, December 7, 1932, as reported to the floor leader.

#### WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m.)

Hearings on beer bill.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

742. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a copy of the fourth annual report of the Puerto Rican Hurricane Relief Commission (H. Doc. No. 486); to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

743. A letter from the Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a report of the Migratory Bird Conservation Commission for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1932 (H. Doc. No. 487); to the Committee on Agriculture and ordered to be printed.

744. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting the annual report of the sales of surplus property in the possession of the War Department within the United States, as shown in reports received from the various field agencies during the period October 15, 1931, to October 15, 1932, inclusive; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COCHRAN of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 13303) to amend the Federal home loan bank act to provide for the making of loans by the banks to home owners; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. REID of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 13304) to authorize the appointment of secretaries to United States circuit and district judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 13305) to amend the emergency relief and construction act of 1932 so as to provide for regional mercantile credit corporations; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 13306) to limit the purchases of the Post Office Department, so far as possible, to articles of the growth, production, and manufacture of the United States; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 13307) making it illegal to employ any alien while there are American citizens out of work, who are able and willing to work, and fixing the penalty for willful violation thereof; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 13308) to authorize a survey from Pamlico Sound to Mill Creek, N. C.; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ESTEP: A bill (H. R. 13309) to repeal the national prohibition act, as amended and supplemented; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 13310) to amend the agricultural marketing act, approved June 15, 1929; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 13311) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Allegheny County, Pa., to construct, maintain, and operate a toll bridge across the Monongahela River between the city of Pittsburgh and the borough of Homestead, Pa.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. COLLIER: A bill (H. R. 13312) to provide revenue by the taxation of certain nonintoxicating liquors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CANFIELD: A bill (H. R. 13313) to provide additional revenue, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.



By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13314) to provide for the acquisition of Chappawamsic Island, Va., for the use of the Navy Department; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 13315) to amend paragraph 1, section 201, title 2 of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13316) to amend paragraph 1, section 201, title 2 of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 13317) to amend section 301 (a) (1) of the emergency relief and construction act of 1932; to the Committee on Roads.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Resolution (H. Res. 310) providing for the payment of six months' compensation to the widow of Samuel T. Craig; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. PEAVEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 488) for the relief of Henry A. Behrens; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CANFIELD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 489) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to repeal the eighteenth amendment, and providing for a referendum on a proposed substitute; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DYER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 490) proposing an amendment to the Constitution to repeal the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. PRATT: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 491) proposing an amendment to the eighteenth article of amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the electors of the State of Connecticut, urging the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, and that the power to regulate or to prohibit the manufacture, sale, or transportation of intoxicating liquors be reserved to the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of the City Council of the City of Cambridge, memorializing the Congress of the United States to the speedy modification of the Volstead Act at its session commencing in December, 1932, that will permit the manufacture and sale of beer with a 4 per cent alcoholic content; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Memorial of St. Paul City Council, approving the Garner-Wagner bill, and urging upon Congress and President Hoover its passage and adoption; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Memorial of the municipal government of Balayan, Batangas, P. I., voicing its strong opposition to the Hawes-Cutting bill; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Memorial of the Council of the Seneca Nation of Indians, requesting the clerks of the House of Representatives and of the Senate to notify the officers of the Seneca Nation of all acts proposed in Congress which in any way affect the Seneca Nation; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Memorial of the House of Representatives and the Senate of Puerto Rico, requesting the Congress of the United States to authorize the Legislature of Puerto Rico to legislate in the matter of prohibition; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKBEE: A bill (H. R. 13318) for the relief of Laura B. Hayes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNOLLY: A bill (H. R. 13319) for the relief of James Holl; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13320) for the relief of Daniel Webster Freeman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13321) for the relief of Edward J. Gorman; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13322) for the relief of Alexander H. Vivian; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 13323) for the relief of Gladding, McBean & Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FOSS: A bill (H. R. 13324) for the relief of Everett P. Sheridan and Exilda Sheridan; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT: A bill (H. R. 13325) for the relief of H. J. Walker; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FULMER: A bill (H. R. 13326) granting an increase of pension to Ida C. Watson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GAMBRILL: A bill (H. R. 13327) for the relief of Charles H. Reed; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HARDY: A bill (H. R. 13328) granting an increase of pension to Emma G. Mills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOOPER: A bill (H. R. 13329) granting a pension to Lena P. Riddick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13330) granting an increase of pension to Sophia L. Farlin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13331) granting a pension to Sarah E. Fortner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 13332) for the relief of William Fenwick Howey; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KOPP: A bill (H. R. 13333) granting a pension to May E. Neely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13334) granting a pension to Charles T. Griggs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13335) granting a pension to Emma Hellwig; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13336) granting a pension to Mary Pearl Drake; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13337) granting a pension to Frances S. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAJOR: A bill (H. R. 13338) granting a pension to Ella Mae Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13339) granting a pension to Izuma Shipley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13340) granting a pension to Carrie Isabel Shipley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 13341) granting a pension to Vanela Rider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 13342) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13343) granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PEAVEY: A bill (H. R. 13344) for the relief of the Phillips Creamery Co. (Inc.); to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13345) granting an increase of pension to Sarah St. Germain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PURNELL: A bill (H. R. 13346) granting an increase of pension to Mahala Leazenby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13347) granting an increase of pension to Harry G. Ross; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13348) granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Saxton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 13349) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear and determine the claim of Mount Vernon, Alexandria & Washington Railway Co., a corporation; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SWANSON: A bill (H. R. 13350) granting an increase of pension to Emily L. Burdick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. TARVER: A bill (H. R. 13351) granting a pension to Sarah M. Emmerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13352) for the relief of Marshall W. Sanders; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 13353) granting a pension to Joe S. Turner; to the Committee on Pensions.



By Mr. TREADWAY: A bill (H. R. 13354) for the relief of Holyoke Ice Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM: A bill (H. R. 13355) for the relief of Joe Reno; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: Concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 41) authorizing a special committee to investigate into the facts and circumstances relating to the death of Esther Louise Klein; to the Committee on Rules.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

8665. By Mr. BUCKBEE: Petition of Mr. and Mrs. William Harper and 21 others, residents of Morris, Ill., asking Congress not to change the eighteenth amendment, and stating their opposition to any beer legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8666. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Paul Nielsen and 24 others, residents of Morris, Ill., asking Congress not to change the eighteenth amendment, and stating their opposition to any beer legislation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8667. By Mr. CRAWL: Petition of the Men's Bible Class of the First Methodist Episcopal Church of Los Angeles, Calif., favoring more adequate appropriations for the enforcement of the eighteenth amendment of the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8668. By Mr. GLOVER: Petition of Standard Brake & Shoe Foundry Co.; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

8669. By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: Petition of the West District Woman's Home Missionary Society of Syracuse, N. Y., signed by Ella L. McCarthy and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the creation of a Federal motion-picture commission, and urging the passage of Senate bill 1079 and Senate Resolution 170; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8670. By Mr. HARLAN: Petition of F. A. Hamilton Council, No. 109, Daughters of America, urging passage of House bill 10602; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8671. By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the New York Academy of Medicine, New York City, urging repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8672. Also, petition of the United National Association of Post Office Clerks, opposing continuation of the furlough plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8673. Also, petition of E. S. Ullman, 131 West Thirtieth Street, New York City, urging repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8674. Also, petition of William A. Worboys Co., New York City, urging the use of wooden barrels as containers for beer; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8675. Also, petition of National Association of Letter Carriers, urging repeal of the economy act and the correction of its injustices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8676. By Mr. LUCE: Petition of Woman's Home Missionary Society of Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Cambridge, Mass., relating to motion-picture censorship; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

8677. By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of D. C. H. Harwood, mayor, and 163 other citizens of Charleston, Coles County, Ill., protesting against further moratoriums; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8678. By Mr. ROBINSON: Petition of Mildred Jones, of Gilman, Iowa, signed by about 40 other citizens of Gilman, Iowa, urging that the eighteenth amendment shall not be repealed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8679. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of the Associated Cooperage Industries of America, protesting against discrimination in the method of packaging legal beer as set forth in bills drafted for consideration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8680. By Mr. TARVER: Petition of eighth district convention, Junior Order United American Mechanics of Georgia, asking the enactment of legislation to exclude

aliens from the count in determining congressional representation, and also legislation making it a criminal offense for any person to advocate the destruction of our Government by violence, and also for continued efforts to further restrict foreign immigration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8681. Also, petition of the Cedartown (Ga.) Kiwanis Club, for agricultural relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

8682. Also, petition of J. F. Funderburk and others, of Richland, Ga., protesting against the proposed resolution for the repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8683. By Mr. TEMPLE: Petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Eldora and the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Monongahela, Washington County, Pa., protesting against the repeal of the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8684. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen of Magnet Lodge, No. 227, of Binghamton, N. Y., protesting against the unfair tactics pursued by the National Economy League in their attempt to break down beneficial veteran legislation; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

8685. Also, petition of Helen C. Marshall and other citizens of Missouri, protesting against the passage of any measures providing for the manufacture of beer, for the nullification of the Constitution, or against any proposal to repeal the eighteenth amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8686. Also, petition of Nettie Ireland and other citizens of Oroville, Calif., opposing any legislation to weaken the eighteenth amendment or nullify that part of the Constitution in any way; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8687. Also, petition of the Advent Christian Conference of America, urging support of changes in the naturalization laws which will permit liberty of conscience in citizenship; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

8688. Also, petition of General Eastern Young People's Society of Loyal Workers, opposing any change in the prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

8689. Also, petition of the Unemployed Councils of the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

8690. Also, petition of Jesse C. Duke, asking the impeachment of F. Dickinson Letts, an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia, and of Leo A. Rover, United States attorney for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## SENATE

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 7, 1932

The Chaplain, Rev. Zeb Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, who despisest not the sighing of a contrite heart nor the desire of such as are sorrowful, we humbly beseech Thee mercifully to look upon our infirmities, and for the glory of Thy name turn from us all those evils that we most justly have deserved and grant that in all our troubles and adversities whensoever they oppress us we may rejoice in the comfort of Thy mercy and evermore serve Thee in holiness and pureness of living, to Thy honor and glory; through our only mediator and advocate, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

JAMES J. DAVIS, a Senator from the State of Pennsylvania, and HENRY W. KEYES, a Senator from the State of New Hampshire, appeared in their seats to-day.

#### THE JOURNAL

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. Fess and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.